USDA Forest Service
Management of the National Grasslands

Paper prepared for the symposium on The United States Department of Agriculture in Historical Perspective at Iowa State University (Ames), June 15-18, 1989. Terry West, Historian, USDA Forest Service.

Introduction

".....more free land was homesteaded in the twentieth century than in the nineteenth, but much of it was marginal and never should have been brought under the plow." (Rowley 1985:225).

The origin of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service administered National Grasslands begins with the disposal of public lands in the early 20th century. The Enlarged Homestead Act of 1909, for example, offered free land to those who would cultivate the Great Plains (Rowley 1985:225). Market demand for wheat during and after World War I further motivated "sod-busters" to settle previously bypassed grassland areas and plow them for cultivation.

The intensity of the land rush is told in the records of the government land office in Havre, Montana. In 1912 it had recorded about 3000 entries for land; in 1917, it recorded 7,500. By 1924, the states of the Great Plains were growing 17 million more acres of wheat than in 1909; in 1928 it reached 20 million acres with prices and yields peaking finally in 1931 (Lord 1938:72-73). The removal of the grass that held down the soil on these marginal farm lands contributed to the erosion of the "dustbowl" in the drought years of the 1930s. In that decade an estimated two-and-a-half million people abandoned their small farms, mainly on the plains, many of who migrated to the west coast to work in the fields (Rupp 1975:2). (1) The young author John Steinbeck was so affected by the sight of these families pouring into California to work the fruit harvests that he immortalized them in the novel The Grapes of Wrath.

Land Utilization Projects

The economic and ecological plight of the nation spurred action by the government to mitigate the effects of the depression on the population. The dustbowl lands and peoples became the concern of one of these projects. In 1931 a national conference entitled Land Utilization, which called for a survey of submarginal lands. Once identified, the government began to purchase these lands under the authorization of the National Industrial Act of 1933 and Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1935. The aim was to control erosion, produce more forage, and ensure economic stability for remaining rural residents. Depleted cropland was planted with grass and the rangeland grazed on a rotating basis. In some areas newly formed grazing associations arose to ensure access to government grazing land by its members through a joint permitee system. Water and soil conservation projects were undertaken by various government programs.

The purchased lands were called Land Utilization (L-U) projects (Heintz 1989) after the title of the 1931 conference. Between 1933 and 1946, there were 250 L-U projects on 11.3 million

acres in 45 states. By voluntary sales (of inhabited lands) the government obtained title to this land for $47.5 million or about $4.40 an acre (Wilson 1965:v).

The lands were first administered by the Resettlement Administration, later named the Farm Security Administration. In 1937, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (Title III) gave custody to the Secretary of Agriculture and authorized more extensive conservation efforts. In 1938 the Soil Conservation Service was given the task of managing the L-U lands, a mission that lasted until 1953 when the Forest Service was assigned the duty.

Soil Conservation Service project work focused on grazing, forests, recreation, wildlife, and watershed protection. During the depression years unemployed locals were hired by relief agencies to work on Land Utilization soil conservation projects enabling those who stayed on the land to survive. In this period the Civilian Conservation Corps was also active on the Great Plains (Lord 1938). From 1938 to 1942, the CCC planted a belt of trees from Mexico to Canada (largely on private lands) to serve as a "shelterbelt" against wind erosion. (Droze 1977). Specific Soil Conservation Service projects included building stock water ponds, reservoirs, seeding grasslands (Crested-wheat a bunch-grass originally imported from Siberia was widely planted), and fire control. The period after World War II was one of intense range rehabilitation by the SCS. By the time the Forest Service obtained the L-U lands many areas were already restored and needed only continued maintenance to protect the gains.

Great Plains L-U Changes

Government administration of L-U lands resulted in shifts in land use patterns in the Great Plains. Douglas Hurt (1985:147) contends that New Deal social scientists had urged public ownership of L-U lands "on the belief that the needs of society were superior to those of the individual." After purchase of the Land Utilization lands, there were practical demonstrations of the best soil conservation techniques to set an example for adjacent private land holders (ibid:148). Since these advisors believed that private landowners also had an obligation to future generations to conserve the land through wise use. To reinforce the lesson, privately held lands were organized into soil conservation districts (Parks 1952). The purpose was to ensure integrated application of conservation practices in the areas of mixed land ownership.

The L-U lands were not intended to be permanent natural areas; instead the goal was to transform marginal farmland into productive rangeland (Wooten 1965:53). Other resources were to be managed on the L-U lands but the restoration of the local economy through ranching was the critical goal during the depression and afterwards. In this respect the L-U projects were a success (Grest 1953:44; Hurt 1985) in altering plains agricultural practices "from uncertain crop farming to stabilized grass production" (Grest 1953:44).

USDA Forest Service and the National Grasslands

By Secretary of Agriculture Administrative Order dated 24 December 1953 (effective 2 January 1954), USDA Reorganization Act, administration of the L-U lands was transferred from the SCS to the Forest Service. "The original intent was for the Forest Service to act as interim manager

pending final disposal of these acquired lands" (Rupp 1975:4). At this time there were over ten million acres of L-U lands, most located in the Great Plains.

Discussion continued over the future status of the lands until 1958, when a revised policy disposed of around six million acres to states and colleges. Most of the remaining four million acres was retained by the Forest Service as part of the National Forest System (Rupp 1975:4). A Secretary of Agriculture Administrative Order on 20 June 1960 designated 3,804,000 acres of the land into 19 National Grasslands. The USDA Forest Service was now responsible for the permanent retention and management of the grasslands. This new task created some internal confusion in the agency regarding the place of the National Grasslands in the forest service and their national function.

The 1960 order stated the National Grasslands were to be part of the National Forest System for administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. It also read that the Forest Service was to manage these lands for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes. Many in the agency debated what it meant "to manage as part of the National Forest System"? In the words of Deputy Regional Forester (Region 2) Craig Rupp (1975:5):

> Many Forest Service administrators interpreted this to mean to manage the Grasslands the same as National Forests. Others were of the opinion that the National Grasslands were only big cattle pastures (existing) solely for the use and benefit of the grazing users. Still others saw the grasslands as a bastard child and the best alternative was to dispose of them.

SCS Practices and Grazing Associations

When the Forest Service took over management of the grasslands from the Soil Conservation Service existing "SCS policies were not readily accepted" by the new administrators (LaPoint 1989:3). The Forest Service had managed rangeland for fifty years and many of its range staff felt that the grasslands should abide by established agency practices. One area of difference was working with grazing associations. The SCS had entered into cooperative agreements in 1939 with Great Plains State Grazing Associations and Districts. Clearly, the Soil Conservation Service was agreeable to a policy of working with grazing associations when this step facilitated SCS soil conservation goals. These associations had started as early as 1931 in the Great Plains when stockmen organized to request congress to withdraw public domain land from homesteading and permit it to be leased on a long-term basis (Alt 1988:2). The key is that the land under control of the association is grazed only by its members. (2)

Forest Service officials were reluctant to surrender control of activities such as issuing permits, collecting fees, controlling trespass and fires to grazing associations. However, the mass transfer of SCS employees in Montana and the Dakotas to the Forest Service in this transition period of management of the national grasslands led to the eventual acceptance of many of the SCS practices. The current policy is to rely on grazing associations where practical. This arrangement is most common in the larger L-U rangelands in the northern Great Plains.

Direction for management of the National Grasslands was expanded in 1963 when the 1960 Order was amended. The additions served to reinforce the original L-U mission of promoting grassland agriculture and sustained-yield management; while demonstrating sound land use practices to adjacent public and private landholders (Wooten 1965:33). Since 1963, the Forest Service employees of the National Grasslands have labored to carry out this mandate. I will now examine several topics in the contemporary administrative history of the national grasslands derived from interviews with former or current employees.

Audit and Issues

Between December 1972 and May 1973, the office of the Inspector General (USDA) conducted an "audit" of the National Grasslands. The regional variations in ecology and history of the grasslands make generalizations difficult. However, the audit did highlight some trends that are worth discussion. One finding was that there had been significant progress in rehabilitating the grasslands, but less success in promoting conservation practices on adjoining lands. One explanation for the failure to promote grassland agriculture in areas such as Colorado was that it was not "economically alluring and rewarding as cultivation and participation in price support programs" (Audit Report 1973:5). Local-level USDA personnel of the National Grasslands and Farm Home Administration each advocated opposite programs to local farmers. The former promoted grazing while the latter were encouraging grain cultivation.

Another area of concern identified in the audit was the negative attitude of some grasslands employees toward grazing associations. In the words of one National Grassland manager: "...association management was like hiring an army of rabbits to guard the cabbage patch" (Audit Report 1973:5). By the 1970s, northern New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas National Grasslands ceased to have grazing associations. Instead, individual grazing permits were issued and the grassland units fenced-off to make separate pastures. The change was a logical adaptation to the region's ecology and land use patterns. The L-U lands purchased in this area by the government were smaller than in the northern Great Plains. For example, the Black Kettle (Texas) allotments ranged from 30 acres to the largest at 1500 acres.

The absence of grazing associations in the region complicated attempts to promote grassland conservation. National Grassland workers had to preach the message to each individual rancher because collective conversion was impossible without associations. In addition, there were national grasslands managers who did not feel that their duty extended to private property (ibid:13).

Changed Agendas

"In 1971, about 195 thousand cattle and horses and 37,000 sheep and goats grazed 1.25 million animal unit months on the National Grasslands. National Grassland revenues were mainly from mineral leases, especially oil and gas, which contributed 1.4 million dollars in fiscal year (FY) 1972, compared to $700,000 for livestock grazing fees." (Audit Report 1973:1). (3)

Two trends intersected in the public arena in the 1970s, which placed land managers in a bind. The dilemma arose from the clash between environmental concerns and the needs of an

expanding national economy and population. The post World War II economic "boom" fostered a national consensus that resource extraction and industrial production were positive contributions to the public good. But growth had environmental consequences, which became apparent in the 1970s. This awareness led to the passage of laws aimed at curbing the destruction of the environment. These controls, however, collided with public fears of resource scarcity and economic decline in the U.S. National Grassland management reflected these contradictory trends and the balance among resource uses became a public issue.

Fossil fuels and "red meat" (beef cattle) were two resources on the national grasslands that commanded national attention in this period. In 1973 an ad hoc interagency committee was formed with the purpose of seeking answers "on how the national grasslands can best be utilized to promote grasslands agriculture and further USDA programs in the Great Plains" (Regional Forester W.J. Lucas letter to Chief 1973). Lucas, the director of the Rocky Mountain region of the forest service, was appointed chair of this committee. The increasing pressure for strip mining coal (at a time of national energy crisis) was a primary concern of this group of public land managers.

Two years later, in a period of large-scale shipments of grains to the Soviet Union, another national need shaped policy. Concerned that grain shortages would decrease cattle production, Forest Service range management staff visualized the national grasslands as centers of cattle production since the animals there relied on forage rather than grains (Forest Service document Cooperative Range Management Program 1975:1). The estimated "red meat" production off the National Grasslands in 1971 was 75 million pounds. The management pressure for beef production was felt mainly on the northern Great Plains national grasslands.

The People

Historians of the Forest Service have observed that despite the agency's well-known esprit-de-corps not all of its employees feel included in the mainstream of the organization. The National Grasslands are one example. Ever since its establishment in 1905, the Forest Service employed mainly foresters who worked on the National Forests. Suddenly in 1954 it found itself charged with care of a new type of resource--treeless, flat, grasslands. Those early employees who were assigned to work on the grasslands sometimes felt forgotten by the rest of the agency. A former grasslands ranger (1972-76) expressed this view:

"A lot of people (in the forest service) felt that when you were sent to the National Grasslands that it was like being shipped to Siberia in the agency. But, for many, once they were there a few years, they never wanted to return to the national forests."

The trend toward segregation of the two staffs within the forest service was a concern of management. At late as 1975 at a national grasslands conference held in Arlington, Texas, Deputy Chief Tom Nelson remarked in his speech: "I think over the years there has been some concern as to whether or not the national grasslands were considered an integral part of the national forest system." The personal consequence of the lack of integration was to place grasslands people at a disadvantage in career advancement competition. John McLemore, a ranger on the Black Kettle national grassland in New Mexico from 1965 to 1973, contends: "In

those days you were forgotten about for promotions if you worked on the national grasslands...I believe you advanced further and faster on a National Forest than on a National Grassland. I liked my job at the time so I didn't complain until later."

Not all of those interviewed agreed that grasslands service was a career liability, but they all concurred that the mainstream forest service looked askance at the national grasslands. One employee of the grasslands since 1961 commented: "I think the Forest Service thought the grasslands was a desert, and they still do not think much different: they kind of look down on the grasslands--there are no trees." Former grasslands ranger Deen Boe has also observed the agency's timber management bias but noted that this is found mainly among western foresters: "The National Grasslands did feel slighted in the forest service since the tree is a symbol of the agency and not grass. In fact, a lot of people in the forest service wonder why we manage the national grasslands. I find this timber-dominated view less east of the Rockies; they have a broader view of the multiple resources we manage than western saw log foresters do."

On Their Own

Many of the employees who worked on the national grasslands enjoyed the job because of the independence and way of life. Bill Bradshaw, a district ranger on the Thunder Basin from 1961-64, described his time on the grasslands as "the best four years in the forest service because as long as I didn't ruffle too many feathers, I just ran it like I would a ranch" (Hinton ms. chapter 8, page 5). The two reasons why national grassland people were left alone were noted by one former employee: "The Forest Service never really paid much attention to the grasslands. The agency wasn't set up to handle this kind of resource." In brief, the novelty of managing a resource that held little appeal to many in the forest service resulted in a "you-are-on-your-own" style of grasslands management. In retrospect, this action appears to have had excellent results, especially in the critical early years of forest service administration of the national grasslands. One factor was that the people are the selected to work on the grasslands were often natives of the region. Jim McLemore, for example, tells how he was picked to work on a national grassland.

"I didn't apply for the job; in those days (1965) you didn't have the option of picking jobs. I imagine that they looked for people suited to work on the national grasslands. With my degree in range management and being from north central Texas, I suppose I seemed like a natural to be picked for the job. After I got started I was tickled to death. Most people raised in an environment with mountains don't like the Great Plains, but it was home for me."

The absence of rules and supervision resulted in decentralized management. Deen Boe, a ranger on the Custer National Forest grassland from 1967 to 1972 notes: "We felt that the regular forest service misunderstood our actions or could care less, thus we ran the national grasslands on our own. A ranger on the national grasslands had lots of leeway, as there were not a lot of rules to bind him. The national grasslands don't have a lot of rules; instead in the northern Plains we operated with the grazing associations who dealt with day-to-day operations. The Bankhead-Jones Act was not very specific on L-U lands."

Not only did they design their own work projects (develop stock water ponds, well-drilling, grass planting, gully erosion checks, etc.), often the technology appropriate for the work was invented on site. One long time employee stated: "The source of our innovations was mainly from our range conservation professionals and technicians, the innovators were local employees. One old-timer had a ranching background and knew what would work."

Jim McLemore seconds this observation on the sources of ideas for project implementation: "Lots of ideas we figured out on our own; we had our GS-5 range technician who was born and raised in the area, he had a lot of background (to draw on). I guess I listened to anybody who had something to say. I didn't have enough forest service background to know the forest service system of operating. Instead, I followed what my neighbors did. I had a high regard for the people who worked for me, very capable people."

Multiple-use, multiple Views

"The grassland acquisition brought the role of integrative management back into the mainstream of forest service range management administration" (Halcoyn La Point 1989:4).

"More of the professionals assigned to Forests should have an opportunity to work on the Grasslands in order to gain experience and expertise in a broad range of resource management activities" (Deputy Chief Tom Nelson 1975:2).

Two differences in the make-up of the National Grasslands helped shape the vision of those who managed them. One is that unlike the large tracts of land that form the national forests, the national grasslands tend to be made up of dispersed units that are intermingled with state, private, and other federal lands. This pattern of land tenure calls for integrated resource management since a project on one parcel of land has consequences on the land of a neighbor. The result is the ranger must have an active community outreach program.

Two former rangers on the national grasslands comment on the differences between the grasslands and a ranger district on a national forest:

"The real difference is that everything we do on a national grassland is something we do for the adjacent land owners to emulate, we have that in mind when we do projects. I don't really think that we have this idea on national forests, i.e., that we expect adjacent owners to be influenced by our practices."

"The grassland rangers don't tend to be confined by boundaries. They think more of an area concept that is larger than just the federal land they supervise. I thought every ranger should serve on a national grassland because it develops the ability to look at the broad picture of resource management. You learn to deal with different landowners, you learn that the forest service is not alone but part of a larger whole. The primary mission of the forest service in the national grasslands was promotion of sound resource management. You don't do this as a lone wolf. Instead, you coordinate resource management with others as an everyday experience."

Some common examples of coordinated projects include water wells drilled on state land with pipelines crossing private and federal lands. Gas and oil deposits are not confined to map boundaries.

The absence of trees in the grasslands focused attention on the other resources that exist on the national grasslands. In addition to range, managers developed programs for watersheds, recreation,, wildlife, minerals, and even cultural resources. The amount of funds and effort allocated to each of these resource programs was, of course, uneven and regional with some grasslands tilting the balance toward certain ones with other units favoring a different emphasis. Overall, the Washington Office of the forest service felt a need in 1975 to urge national grassland managers that "Wildlife, watershed, and recreation aspects of the National Grasslands need more emphasis" (Nelson 1975:3). It was in this period that public scrutiny of the grasslands increased, along with interest in recreational opportunities.

Current Conditions and Changes

The national environmental focus of the 1970s on the national forests spilled over to the national grasslands. District rangers on both national grasslands and forest districts found that local concerns over specific project impacts were transformed into national issues. The resulting conflicts among special interest groups coupled with legal appeals led to a lose of local control by the ranger. Local land-use decisions were now being made by higher-level staff in the agency. Past resource management prided itself on being exempt from politics with decisions based on scientific knowledge. The conflicts between local resource users and national environmental groups over specific projects on public lands has intensified political pressure on the agency. The outcome is more often decided in the political or legal arena than by those charged with managing the resources. On the grasslands this has meant the employment of wildlife biologists and an increased stress on non-commodity resources. The change in management emphasis was upsetting to some grazing associations, since they felt their authority to manage was undermined. Nonetheless, grassland staffs feel that strides have been made toward a more balanced resources program on the units. One current employee claims: "By now we have a better understanding of what the national grasslands should be. We now better manage other resources on the national grasslands. The shift from strict range management hasn't been easy but we now have real neat things done. We just have to get the associations to go along."

One reason for increased public scrutiny of the national grasslands is a result of their discovery by a public seeking outdoor access in states with few public lands.

"In the last 10 years the Northern Great Plains national grasslands are noted more by the general public because of land management planning. The outdoor recreation interests are interested in more than just range use which conflicts with the traditional users. People are discovering the variety of resources on the national grasslands; compared to wooded areas there is a wealth of wildlife in the grasslands."

Unfinished Business

One subject that requires further research is the outcome of efforts to influence private landowners to practice sound resource management. The results appear to be mixed. In areas where crop production on marginal lands is now viable because of changed technology, the promotion of grassland agriculture is more difficult. One former Curlew (Idaho) grassland employee claims some success with specific projects: "They duplicated the wind protection projects and a few were interested in wildlife enhancement as they organized hunting clubs on their lands and charged fees to outsiders to hunt.

Our water demonstrations (irrigation systems) have been copied by the private sector because the things we've done have been practical, economical."

In Texas one former ranger had this experience: "This is something I couldn't measure. If the local ranchers learned from the national grasslands or not? It probably was an uphill labor but I didn't realize it at the time. I thought I was doing urgent business but I didn't rent a hall and yell at the ranchers. I'd just demonstrate it on the national grassland. Looking back, maybe the examples caught on. The ranchers in west Texas are not far-sighted enough; the southwest may turn into a desert because of poor grazing, poor management by the private sector."

To this veteran the benefit of the national grasslands is that they offer a rare opportunity to demonstrate sound long-term land-use management practices that are neglected by the private sector.

Summary

Several aspects of Forest Service administration of the grasslands from 1954 to 1989 should be emphasized. The broad outline of Forest Service administration of the grassland may be outlined as follows. National grasslands management was a new responsibility for a forestry-based agency. To cope with the task the agency relied on veteran SCS employees, which helped ensure a continuity of policy on the L-U lands. The administrative isolation of the national grasslands created a sense of uniqueness and independence on the part of the small staffs on the national grasslands. Because they were few in number, the unit employees shared information, worked as a team, and invented solutions to project needs while out in the field. The absence of a well-defined mission sometimes led to debates about the purpose of the national grasslands within the agency. Some stressed range management while others a more balanced resource mix. By the 1970s multiple use of resources came to the fore in the agency and the national grasslands began to emphasize recreation and wildlife. By the 1980s on the northern Great Plains this additional stress on other resources challenged the traditional working relationship the units had with grazing associations. Present-day rangers enjoy less local control than their predecessors since management decisions are often made at higher levels of the agency than before. The agency still must struggle to integrate personnel of the national grasslands and the national forests in the national forest system. There will always be those employees who dread the thought of being assigned to the Great Plains. Yet, if those who are there are helping prevent another dustbowl, perhaps they are "serving the people and caring for the land" in a real sense.

Footnotes:

(1) "Among the critical agricultural problems of the 1930s was the cultivation of a large acreage of submarginal farmland--land that could not profitably grow crops. Mortgage foreclosures, tax delinquencies, and personal hardship were commonplace in areas where large acreages of submarginal land was being farmed. Severe droughts, floods, erosion, poor cultivation practices, neglect, and frequently abandonment were causing heavy damage to the land." Wilson 1965:5

(2) Continuity of permitees is common in the grazing associations of the northern Great Plains. For example, "75% of current ones in the Medora Association can trace their permits back to the original members of the 1930s" La Point 1989:2

(3) To replace property tax revenues lost due to federal land ownership, the government returns 25% of grassland revenues to the counties for schools and roads. In 1988, payments to counties from National Grassland and Land Utilization projects receipts totaled $7,186,810. Payments ranged from $3,508,722 paid to North Dakota to $64.75 paid to California; 23 states received payments. (The Friday Newsletter, No. 11. 24 March 1989, USDA Forest Service, PAO, Washington, D.C.)

Bibliography

Alt, Bernard
1988 Letter of 21 March 1981 to Dr. Henry C. Dethloff, Intaglio Inc., College Station, Texas. "Grasslands Historical Document."

Audit Report
1973 Audit Report. Forest Service. National Grasslands Administration. Report No. 60183-1-H. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Office of the Inspector General. Washington, D.C.

Cooperative Range Management Program
1975 State and Private Forestry Rangeland Cooperative Range Management Program. Forest Service. USDA. Washington, D.C.

Droze, Wilmon H.
1977 Trees, Prairies, and People: A History of Tree Planting in the Plains States. Denton, Texas's Woman's University.

(The) Friday Newsletter
1989 "Grassland LUP Payments Distributed". Page 1, The Friday Newsletter. No. 11. March 24, 1989. Public Affairs Office, USDA Forest Service. Washington, D.C.

Grest, Edward G.
1953 The Range Story of the Land Utilization Projects. Journal of Range Management. No. 6. Pp. 44-50. February.

Heintz, Tom

1989 The National Grasslands of the Northern Region. USDA Forest Service Brochure. Region 1. Grand River & Cedar River National Grasslands. Lemmon, South Dakota.

Hinton, Wayne
nd. History of the Forest Service Rocky Mountain Region. Contract 53-3187-6-25. Unpublished manuscript. History Program, USDA Forest Service. Washington, D.C.

Hurt, Douglas R.
1985 "The National Grasslands: Origin and Development in the Dust Bowl." In, The History of Soil and Water Conservation. Edited by Douglas Helms and Susan L. Flader. PP. 144-157. Washington, D.C. The Agricultural History Society.

Lord, Russell
1938 To Hold This Soil. Miscellaneous Publication No. 321. USDA. Soil Conservation Service. Washington, D.C.

La Point, Halcoyn
1989 Oral History of the Grazing Associations. Paper presented at the 1989 Society of Range Management Meeting. Custer National Forest. Dickson, ND.

Lucas, W.J.
1973 Letter to Chief of the USDA Forest Service. 3 August 1973 on Ad Hoc Committee on National Grasslands in the Great Plains. Region 2, USDA Forest Service.

Nelson, Tom
1975 Remarks by Deputy Chief Tom Nelson at National Grassland Conference, Arlington, Texas. December 10, 1975. Transcript.

Parks, W. Robert
1952 Soil Conservation Districts in Action. Ames, The Iowa State College Press.

Rowley, William D.
1985 U.S. Forest Service Grazing and Rangelands: A History. College Station. Texas A & M University Press.

Rupp, Craig
1975 History of National Grasslands. Paper presented by Deputy Regional Forester Craig Rupp at National Grassland Conference. Arlington, Texas. December 10.

Russell, Ted
1975 "History of National Grasslands. Paper presented by Ted Russell,

Director, Range Management, Northern Region, USDA Forest Service. National Grasslands Conference. Arlington, Texas. 10 December.

Wilson, M.L
1965 Forward to Agricultural Economic Report No. 85.

Wooten, H.H.
1965 The Land Utilization Program, 1934 to 1964: Origin, Development, and Present Status. Agricultural Economic Report No. 85. USDA Economic Research Service.